

APPLICATION NO.

10/619,712

SUITE 1201

34704

United States Patent and Trademark Office

FILING DATE

07/14/2003

BACHMAN & LAPOINTE, P.C.

900 CHAPEL STREET

NEW HAVEN, CT 06510

09/28/2004

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 03-422 7755

EXAMINER

YEE, DEBORAH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1742

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR

Werner Menk

Office Action Summan		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/619,712	MENK, WERNER
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Deborah Yee	1742
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).			
Status			
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>_</u> .	
2a)	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	s action is non-final.	
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is		
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims			
4)🖂	4) Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are pending in the application.		
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
	6) Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are rejected.		
	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.			
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage			
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.			
Attachment(c)			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)			
2) 🔲 Notice 3) 🔯 Inforn	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date 10-24-03,7-14-03.	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	
Date of Table 100			

Art Unit: 1742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1,6,8,9,11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by UK patent 1,482,724, cited in IDS dated 10-24-03.
- 3. UK patent discloses a cast iron alloy on lines 40 to 70 on page 2 which meets the claimed composition by containing 2.2%C and 0.6%Ni, Mo, Al, and Si, and has a lamellar (vermicular) to nodular spherical graphite, and is used in an internal combustion engine exposed to exhaust gas.
- 4. Claims 1 to 3, 8,9, 11,12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Reynaud et al. (US Patent 5,236,600) cited in IDS dated 10-24-03.
- 5. Reynaud in the Table of column 4 discloses a specific cast iron example (4th example from the left) which meets the claimed composition by containing 2.47 to 2.772 %C, 5.1%Si and Al and Mo. Note that Carbon content is calculated by Ceq equation of 4.5 to 4.8%=C+.33Si +0.16Al recited by claim 6. Moreover pior art cast iron alloy can contain vermicular or spheroidal graphite and meets claims 8 and 9,and is used in an internal combustion engine for an exhaust manifold and meets claims 11 and 15.

Application/Control Number: 10/619,712

Art Unit: 1742

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 5, 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Reynaud et al. (US Patent 5,236,600) cited by applicant in IDS dated 10-24-03.
- 7. Reynaud in claims 1 to 11 of columns 4-6 discloses a vermicular or spheroidal graphite cast iron alloy having a composition with constituents whose wt% ranges overlap those recited by the claims; such overlap renders applicant's composition prima facie obvious because it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select the claimed ranges from the broader disclosure of the prior art because the prior art has the same utility (exhaust manifold in turbine housing) and similar properties, high temperature strength and oxidation resistance. See MPEP 2144.05.
- 8. In regard to claim 10, note that Zr and Mg have a lower limit of zero and there need no be present.
- 9. Claims 2 to 5, 7, 10, 12 to 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over UK patent 1,482,724, cited in IDS dated 10-24-03.
- 10. UK'724 in claims 1 and 2 on pages 2 and 3 discloses a cast iron alloy having a vermicular or spheroidal graphite cast iron alloy having a composition with constituents whose wt% ranges overlap those recited by the claims 2 to 5, 7 and 10;

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/619,712

Art Unit: 1742

such overlap renders applicant's composition prima facie obvious because it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select the claimed ranges from the broader disclosure of the prior art because the prior art has similar utility and properties, which are components used in a turbine combustion engine and high temperature properties. See MPEP 2144.05.

- 11. In regard to claim 12, UK'724 on lines 16-30 on page 1 discloses using cast iron for internal combustion engines which broadly include exhaust manifolds.
- 12. Even though UK'724 does not teach using Al-Zr as a prealloy immediately added before the alloy melt is cast as recited in claim 14, such would not be a patentable distinction because UK'724 teaches Al and Zr as alloying constituents which are added to the melt before casting, and applicant has not demonstrated (e..g by comparative test data) why Al-Zr as a prealloy vs. adding Al and Zr separately would be critical and productive of new and unexpected results. Moreover, even though the melt with a temperature of over 1460C before casting recited in claim 14 is not taught by prior art, such would not be a patentable distinction. Note that it is conventionally practice that a temperature at alloy melting point or greater is required to provide a homogeneous mixture before casting. Applicant has not established why 1460C is somehow critical and productive of new and unexpected results. Hence claim would not patentably distinguish over prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deborah Yee whose telephone number is 571-272-1253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 to 2:30.

Art Unit: 1742

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Deborah Yee Primary Examiner Art Unit 1742